



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,097	06/15/2001	Valerie De La Poterie	05725.0905-00	7312
22852	7590	04/20/2009		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER SOROUSH, LAYLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2009 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9
10 *Ex parte* VALERIE DE LA POTERIE, JEAN MONDET,
11 and FREDERIC AUGUSTE
12

13
14 Appeal 2008-5435
15 Application 09/881,097
16 Technology Center 1600
17

18
19 Oral Hearing Held: Wednesday, March 18, 2009
20
21

22
23 Before TONI R. SCHEINER, DONALD E. ADAMS, and RICHARD M.
24 LEOVITZ, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
25

26 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:
27

28 MARK D. SWEET, ESQ.
29 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner
30 901 New York Avenue, Northwest
31 Washington, D.C. 20001-4413
32

33 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
34 March 18, 2009, commencing at 9:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
35 Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room B, Alexandria, Virginia,
36 before Priscilla S. Hopchas, Notary Public.
37
38

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Good morning. Calendar number 20, appeal number 2008-5435, Mr. Sweet.

JUDGE SCHEINER: Thank you. Good morning. I apologize we're getting a late start, my fault.

MR. SWEET: Oh, that's okay. I'm right around the corner, so I was rushing to get here. I was a little late myself, so -- but I think I'll make up for lost time, too, because I don't anticipate spending much time at all.

JUDGE SCHEINER: All right.

MR. SWEET: Thank you very much; good morning to all of you. Single issue in this case, as you know, it seems to me that the Examiner and I are ships passing in the night versus function and property. And that's solely what I want to talk about.

The Examiner keeps saying you're defining your invention functionally, and we have been arguing over and over again that we're not defining it functionally, in fact we've defined it with three specific properties. And there's really not that much more to say because, I mean, we have the physical property of it, you know, being semi-crystalline, that we've recited; we have the physical property of the transition temperature range; and we have the physical property of the water solubility limitation that's recited in the claim.

So I just want to emphasize that, I don't understand and I'm asking you to clarify for me if possible, how those physical properties can be viewed as functional, because we are not defining our thermal transition agent functionally.

1 JUDGE SCHEINER: Right, the only functional aspect of the claim
2 would be in the next clause, where it has to function together with the film
3 forming --

4 MR. SWEET: Sure.

5 JUDGE SCHEINER: -- agent to -- right. But that's not, correct me if
6 I'm wrong, the Examiner didn't raise that issue --

7 MR. SWEET: No, the Examiner is totally saying you haven't, you're
8 only defining the thermal transition agent functionally, and that's solely what
9 we don't understand, because we have those three specific properties. And
10 in fact we added one of those during prosecution, where we narrowed it
11 from, where we recited the semi-crystalline nature and narrowed the scope.

12 JUDGE SCHEINER: Right. Your invention, it could be crystalline
13 or semi-crystalline; you have an example of crystalline, and then you --

14 MR. SWEET: Yeah, we have those polyethylene waxes.

15 JUDGE SCHEINER: And your example, you have the single, or I
16 guess it's a sub genus of the polycaprolactones?

17 MR. SWEET: Yes, yeah. That's right. Because we have examples in
18 the spec of all the, excuse me, of the thermal transition agent, some being
19 crystalline, some non-crystalline, then as you go through the specification
20 we talk about the hydroxyl number being a class of the semi-crystalline, and
21 even below that an exemplified subclass of those hydroxyl numbered
22 semi-crystalline.

23 JUDGE ADAMS: And it would be your position that the
24 semi-crystalline compound having these particular properties, not
25 properties -- yes, properties; when combined with the film-forming polymer

1 would necessarily end up with these requirements that you have in the
2 second clause of your claim; is that correct?

3 MR. SWEET: Oh, I wouldn't say that that's an inherent property, if
4 that's what you're leading -- I think that that's another limitation of the claim,
5 that you're going to have to have, you know, those properties, and as you
6 recognize, no doubt, the limitations in that second clause are really trying to
7 convey the aspect that it's resistant, it's cold water resistant, but can be
8 removed by warm water. And those are the properties.

9 But I wouldn't say that that's an inherent property that would
10 necessarily result from the combination of all of these thermal transition
11 agents with any film forming agent. I mean this is, this is another limitation
12 that must be considered.

13 JUDGE ADAMS: And tell me if I'm wrong here, but the Examiner
14 recognizes that there are other semi-crystalline compounds other than those
15 that you disclosed in your specification that are known to those in the art; is
16 that right?

17 MR. SWEET: Okay, sure, I agree with that, yes. And we've had prior
18 art rejections in the past based, for example, on polyurethanes, and to the
19 extent that those things are known out there, then they should be applied in a
20 prior rejection, but for purposes of our discussion today, I think that they can
21 be identified, and I think certainly the language of our claim shows that the
22 Appellants were in possession of that concept.

23 JUDGE ADAMS: Any reason, just off the top of my head question
24 here; any reason why you didn't give the Examiner, you know, a cookie and
25 say well, here's representative compounds that fall within this --

1 MR. SWEET: Well, in one of my responses I started out by pointing
2 out that she had rejected the claims, you know, based on prior art, for
3 example, those polyurethanes. But quite frankly, when I read the response I
4 didn't like the tone of it, so I backed down from it a little bit. But you know,
5 also --

6 JUDGE ADAMS: You answered, just a minute --

7 MR. SWEET: Well, I --

8 JUDGE ADAMS: Is that what you're telling me, that you --

9 MR. SWEET: Oh, no, no.

10 JUDGE ADAMS: -- guys got a little hot-headed and you --

11 MR. SWEET: Oh, I don't think so. I mean I was an ex-examiner, I
12 was here for almost nine years, so I always take great pains to be very
13 respectful, and my first draft of the response in my opinion may not have
14 been as respectful as I wanted it, so I toned it back down, because I always
15 strive to be 100 percent professional and respectful.

16 Trust me, I know; I was on the other side, so I know the arguments.

17 JUDGE SCHEINER: I think we understand the issues, issue, single
18 issue. So would that be -- unless you have something further, this is --

19 MR. SWEET: I don't, I don't at all, I told you this would be --

20 JUDGE SCHEINER: -- a short hearing.

21 MR. SWEET: -- short and sweet.

22 JUDGE SCHEINER: Yes.

23 MR. SWEET: So thank you very much.

24 JUDGE SCHEINER: Thank you for coming today, and again, I
25 apologize for getting a late start.

26

MR. SWEET: No worries, thank you. Have a great day.
(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 9:15 a.m.)